

Date: Thu, 29 Apr 93 04:30:23 PDT  
From: Ham-Policy Mailing List and Newsgroup <ham-policy@ucsd.edu>  
Errors-To: Ham-Policy-Errors@UCSD.Edu  
Reply-To: Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu  
Precedence: Bulk  
Subject: Ham-Policy Digest V93 #119  
To: Ham-Policy

Ham-Policy Digest                      Thu, 29 Apr 93                      Volume 93 : Issue 119

Today's Topics:

    Isn't CB the perfect experimenter's band? (4 msgs)

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu>  
Send subscription requests to: <Ham-Policy-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>  
Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Ham-Policy Digest are available  
(by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/ham-policy".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text  
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official  
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

-----  
Date: Wed, 28 Apr 1993 15:59:36 GMT  
From: pacbell.com!sgiblab!zaphod.mps.ohio-state.edu!uwm.edu!linac!att!cbnewsm!  
jeffj@network.UCSD.EDU  
Subject: Isn't CB the perfect experimenter's band?  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

With CB having ZERO regulation by the FCC I'm not sure why there  
isn't more experimentation on this band. Guy's are working DX, running  
FM, going in between the channels, etc... Someone could literally put  
up repeaters, run packet, do remote control, etc... and the FCC wouldn't  
do anything about it. FM repeaters for CB, hmmm kinda got a nice ring  
to it. 8-) Just wondering has anyone heard of this type of stuff going  
on CB? I have heard of so many GOOD CB operators complaining of no  
enforcement by the FCC that I am convinced that the band is wide open  
and anything goes! Any comments?

Jeff

--

Jeff Jones AB6MB                      |    OPPOSE THE NORTH AMERICAN FREE TRADE AGREEMENT!

jeffj@seeker.mystic.com | Canada/USA Free Trade cost Canada 400,000 jobs.  
Infolinc BBS 415-778-5929 | Want to guess how many we'll lose to Mexico?

-----  
Date: Wed, 28 Apr 1993 17:43:39 GMT  
From: usc!zaphod.mps.ohio-state.edu!uwm.edu!grc!don@network.UCSD.EDU  
Subject: Isn't CB the perfect experimenter's band?  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <C67B3H.Ety@cbnewsm.cb.att.com> jeffj@cbnewsm.cb.att.com  
(jeffrey.n.jones) writes:  
>With CB having ZERO regulation by the FCC I'm not sure why there  
>isn't more experimentation on this band. Guy's are working DX, running  
>FM, going in between the channels, etc... Someone could literally put  
>up repeaters, run packet, do remote control, etc... and the FCC wouldn't  
>do anything about it. FM repeaters for CB, hmmm kinda got a nice ring  
>to it. 8-) Just wondering has anyone heard of this type of stuff going  
>on CB? I have heard of so many GOOD CB operators complaining of no  
>enforcement by the FCC that I am convinced that the band is wide open  
>and anything goes! Any comments?  
>

As I understand it, the FCC does not require licensing, but it  
certainly has regulations about what type of equipment, power  
levels, modes of transmission, etc. can be used. There is also the  
issue of FCC approved equipment being required. You cannot legally  
use homebrew equipment on CB.

I you are convinced that anything goes on CB, you are welcome to try  
it, but be prepared to get the book thrown at you if you get  
caught.

Donald D. Woelz, K9GR	Office Phone: 414-644-8700
GENROCO, Inc.	K9GR @WB9TYT.#MKE.WI.USA.NOAM
205 Kettle Moraine Drive North	k9gr@k9gr.ampr.org [44.92.1.48]
Slinger, WI 53086 U.S.A.	don@genroco.com

--

Donald D. Woelz	Office Phone: 414-644-8700
GENROCO, Inc.	Toll Free: 800-243-6762
205 Kettle Moraine Drive North	Office Fax: 414-644-6667
Slinger, WI 53086 U.S.A.	24 hr Voicemail: 414-322-3891

-----  
Date: Wed, 28 Apr 1993 20:30:08 GMT  
From: dog.ee.lbl.gov!overload.lbl.gov!agate!howland.reston.ans.net!  
zaphod.mps.ohio-state.edu!uwm.edu!linac!att!cbnewsm!jeffj@network.UCSD.EDU  
Subject: Isn't CB the perfect experimenter's band?

To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <1993Apr28.174339.7063@grc.genroco.com> don@grc.genroco.com (Don Woelz) writes:

>In article <C67B3H.Ety@cbnewsm.cb.att.com> jeffj@cbnewsm.cb.att.com (jeffrey.n.jones) writes:

>>With CB having ZERO regulation by the FCC I'm not sure why there  
>>isn't more experimentation on this band. Guy's are working DX, running  
>>FM, going in between the channels, etc... Someone could literally put  
>>up repeaters, run packet, do remote control, etc... and the FCC wouldn't  
>>do anything about it. FM repeaters for CB, hmmm kinda got a nice ring  
>>to it. 8-) Just wondering has anyone heard of this type of stuff going  
>>on CB? I have heard of so many GOOD CB operators complaining of no  
>>enforcement by the FCC that I am convinced that the band is wide open  
>>and anything goes! Any comments?

>>

>As I understand it, the FCC does not require licensing, but it  
>certainly has regulations about what type of equipment, power  
>levels, modes of transmission, etc. can be used. There is also the  
>issue of FCC approved equipment being required. You cannot legally  
>use homebrew equipment on CB.

It has regulations but no enforcement of them as my surprise at seeing FM being used on CB proved. Let's see, take a commercial multi mode 10 meter rig, clip a diode here and there, bingo, CB in AM, SSB and lo and behold, FM.

>I you are convinced that anything goes on CB, you are welcome to try  
>it, but be prepared to get the book thrown at you if you get  
>caught.

I am perfectly happy on the ham bands thank you! 8-) Though from what I have heard from my CB friends there is virtually no regulation on CB. Be real interesting to see if anyone is actually doing experimentation on the CB bands. Then again, maybe that is not such a bad idea. Open CB up to experimentation. Couldn't get any worse. 8-)

73!

Jeff

--

Jeff Jones AB6MB		OPPOSE THE NORTH AMERICAN FREE TRADE AGREEMENT!
jeffj@seeker.mystic.com		Canada/USA Free Trade cost Canada 400,000 jobs.
Infolinc BBS 415-778-5929		Want to guess how many we'll lose to Mexico?

-----  
Date: Wed, 28 Apr 1993 23:03:51 GMT  
From: dog.ee.lbl.gov!overload.lbl.gov!agate!howland.reston.ans.net!  
zaphod.mps.ohio-state.edu!darwin.sura.net!sgiblab!spies!wicat!  
keithm@network.UCSD.EDU  
Subject: Isn't CB the perfect experimenter's band?  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

jeffj@cbnewsm.cb.att.com (jeffrey.n.jones) writes:

>With CB having ZERO regulation by the FCC I'm not sure why there  
>isn't more experimentation on this band. Guy's are working DX, running  
>FM, going in between the channels, etc... Someone could literally put  
>up repeaters, run packet, do remote control, etc... and the FCC wouldn't  
>do anything about it. FM repeaters for CB, hmmm kinda got a nice ring  
>to it. 8-) Just wondering has anyone heard of this type of stuff going  
>on CB? I have heard of so many GOOD CB operators complaining of no  
>enforcement by the FCC that I am convinced that the band is wide open  
>and anything goes! Any comments?

>Jeff

Check the recent listings of enforcement actions by the FCC. I wouldn't exactly say the FCC is doing nothing. FCC enforcement has stepped up with recent increases in the amounts of fines (sorry, NAL's Notices of Appearant Liability) they are allowed to levy. Admittedly, most of these were to bozos running gigawatt afterburners (linear amps...).

--

Keith McQueen, Wicat Systems Inc. , (801)224-6400	My opinions are
Packet: n7hmf @ nv7v.UT.USA.NA	all mine...
Internet: keithm@wicat.com	...so there!

-----  
Date: (null)  
From: (null)

--

Internet(MX): rick@ricksys.lonestar.org  
If I bounce (the maps have errors that I have no control over) then use  
bo836@cleveland.freenet.edu or ah053@yfn.ysu.edu  
BITNET: bo836%cleveland.freenet.edu@cunyvms or ah053%yfn.ysu.edu@ysub

-----  
Date: 28 Apr 1993 16:39:22 GMT  
From: ucsd.edu!brian@network.UCSD.EDU

To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <1rg1cfINN11t@cronkite.cisco.com>, <1993Apr26.210644.168445@locus.com>, <930427.185749.5j7.rusnews.w165w@ricksys.lonestar.org>  
Subject : Re: MARS operators and coded messages (was Re: MARS)

rick@ricksys.lonestar.org (Richard McCombs KB5SNF) writes:  
>From what I understand MARS doesn't operate under Amateur, ie Part 97  
>regulations, so why would it be a problem for them to obscure the  
>meaning?

Because the discussion Dana relates was taking place not on MARS channels, but on regular amateur frequencies. On THOSE, it's illegal to use codes to obscure meanings.

- Brian

-----  
Date: Wed, 28 Apr 93 15:49:05 GMT  
From: netcomsv!orchard.la.locus.com!prodnet.la.locus.com!atlas.la.locus.com!  
dana@decwrl.dec.com  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <1rg1cfINN11t@cronkite.cisco.com>, <1993Apr26.210644.168445@locus.com>, <1993Apr27.215336.18753@kd4nc.uucp>cus.c  
Subject : Re: MARS operators and coded messages (was Re: MARS)

In article <1993Apr27.215336.18753@kd4nc.uucp> n4tii@kd4nc.uucp (John Reed) writes:

>  
>Sorry, I don't know this editor that well.....anyway...I'm in Air Force  
>MARS and no we do not discuss radio frequencies on the air. We refer to  
>all the frequencies in the form of a designator.  
>The reason why we do this is for national security. And, yes, it is to  
>obscure the meaning of the transmission...the casual listener does not  
>need to know everything MARS does. In the interest of national security,  
>in time of war or something, if sensitive traffic was being routed thru  
>MARS, we don't want "Charlie" following us across the band.

Part 97 prohibits the use of codes and ciphers to obscure the meaning of transmissions on amateur frequencies. If hams who happen to be MARS operators are using amateur frequencies, they must abide by the amateur rules in Part 97. This means that the use of designators to obscure the meaning of your messages is clearly illegal. What MARS ops do on non-amateur frequencies is not an issue.

--

\* Dana H. Myers KK6JQ | Views expressed here are \*  
\* (310) 337-5136 | mine and do not necessarily \*  
\* dana@locus.com DoD #466 | reflect those of my employer  
\*  
\* This Extra supports the abolition of the 13 and 20 WPM tests \*

-----

Date: Wed, 28 Apr 93 15:53:16 GMT  
From: netcomsv!orchard.la.locus.com!prodnet.la.locus.com!atlas.la.locus.com!  
dana@decwrl.dec.com  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <1993Apr26.210644.168445@locus.com>,  
<1rhrjjINN1bi@hpsdl136.sdd.hp.com>, <C658to.KDr@mailier.cc.fsu.edu>a  
Subject : Re: MARS operators and coded messages (was Re: MARS)

In article <C658to.KDr@mailier.cc.fsu.edu> zateslo@geomag.gly.fsu.edu (Ted Zateslo)  
writes:

>In article <1rhrjjINN1bi@hpsdl136.sdd.hp.com> craigb@sdd.hp.com (Craig Bosworth)  
writes:

>>

>>Is it not true that MARS operates near but outside amateur bands? Are

>>MARS operators required to comply with FCC rules for Amateur operators

>>or does DOD have its own set of rules to use on MARS bands?

>>

>>It seems likely that DOD can obscure any meanings it wants to outside

>>the amateur bands...

Agreed. My original note was referencing operation on amateur frequencies.

>You got it. MARS is entirely a DOD operation, on government  
>frequencies. The fact that civilian MARS operators are all  
>(or almost all) licensed hams is just MARS policy. The military  
>can (and indeed must, sometimes) keep things as obscure as  
>possible, and they \_are\_ allowed to use codes and ciphers... :-)  
>

But they are not allowed to use codes and ciphers on amateur  
frequencies. I thought it was clear that I was talking about the  
use of codes on \*amateur\* frequencies.

--

\* Dana H. Myers KK6JQ | Views expressed here are \*  
\* (310) 337-5136 | mine and do not necessarily \*  
\* dana@locus.com DoD #466 | reflect those of my employer  
\*

\* This Extra supports the abolition of the 13 and 20 WPM tests \*

-----  
Date: Wed, 28 Apr 1993 23:09:59 GMT  
From: usc!howland.reston.ans.net!gatech!kd4nc!n4tii@network.UCSD.EDU  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <1rg1cfINN11t@cronkite.cisco.com>, <1993Apr26.210644.168445@locus.com>,  
<930427.185749.5j7.rusnews.w165w@ricksys.lonestar.org>  
Subject : Re: MARS operators and coded messages (was Re: MARS)

MARS is Military Affiliate Radio System...it is not Military Amateur or anything like that....thus MARS does not fall under any Part 97 rules. If there is a need to encrypt messages, or use codes and ciphers, then provisions are made for it. Again, MARS operations are under the DOD and the DOK, not the C.

John  
n4tii%kd4nc.uucp@gatech.edu

-----  
Date: 29 Apr 1993 06:18:01 GMT  
From: ucsd.edu!brian@network.UCSD.EDU  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <1993Apr26.210644.168445@locus.com>,  
<930427.185749.5j7.rusnews.w165w@ricksys.lonestar.org>,  
<1993Apr28.230959.28832@kd4nc.uucp>  
Subject : Re: MARS operators and coded messages (was Re: MARS)

Hmmph. Well, Dana, I guess this just goes to show that passing a code test doesn't guarantee the ability to read and understand plain English.  
- Brian

-----  
Date: Tue, 27 Apr 1993 18:57:49 CST  
From: mvb.saic.com!unogate!news.service.uci.edu!usc!howland.reston.ans.net!darwin.sura.net!sgiblab!nec-gw!netkeeper!vivaldi!seas.smu.edu!utacfd.uta.edu!rwsys!ricksys!news@network.UCSD.EDU  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <1993Apr8.195154.1@engvms.unl.edu>, <1rg1cfINN11t@cronkite.cisco.com>,  
<1993Apr26.210644.168445@locus.com>iblab  
Subject : Re: MARS operators and coded messages (was Re: MARS)

dana@lando.la.locus.com (Dana H. Myers) writes:

> I started laughing and asked "Isn't that intentionally obscuring the  
> meaning of your transmission?". She answered "No, we just don't want  
> people to know what our frequencies are so they don't jam us." I said  
> "But a designator is a coded transmission if you use it to obscure the  
> meaning". She said "We're not obscuring the meaning, we just don't  
> want jammers to know our frequencies".  
>

-----

End of Ham-Policy Digest V93 #119

\*\*\*\*\*